

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, W.P. HEINRICHS AND G. LECOMTE

ASSISTED BY P.J. BEARMAN AND MME S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME VIII
NED — SAM



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1995

they were noted down by "Rūfus and other ancient and modern physicians" (ed. Ullmann, *Rufus von Ephesos, Krankenjournal*, Wiesbaden 1978). The editor tried to prove that the 21 pieces form a unity and that no other physician than Rūfus can be considered as an author. F. Kudlien (in *Clio Medica*, xiv [1979], 148-9, and xv [1981], 137-42) is, however, of a different opinion.

All these writings show Rūfus as an all-round physician, who deals with many pathological questions and who attaches special importance to dietetic prescriptions. As can be inferred from many a remark which he interwove into his representations, he had strong cultural-historical interests. Like Galen he stood in the tradition of Hippocrates, but in contrast to the former he was not apparently interested in current philosophical questions. His attitude was less speculative, but rather, closer to the facts; yet the Middle Ages gave preference to Galen's system, which had a philosophical basis.

Bibliography: *Oeuvres de Rufus d'Éphèse*, publication commencée par Charles Daremberg, continuée et terminée par Charles-Émile Ruelle, Paris 1879 (repr. Amsterdam 1963); J. Ilberg, *Rufus von Ephesos, ein griechischer Arzt in trajanischer Zeit*, in *Abh. d. Sächsischen Akad. d. Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl., xli (1930), no. 1, Leipzig 1930; Sezgin, *GAS*, iii, 64-8; M. Ullmann, *Die Medizin im Islam*, Leiden-Cologne 1970, 71-6; idem, *Die arabische Überlieferung der Schriften des Rufus von Ephesos*, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin, Teilband II, 37, 2 (forthcoming). (M. ULLMANN)

RŪH [see NAFS].

RŪH B. HĀTIM [see RAWḤ B. HĀTIM].

RŪH ALLĀH [see KHUMAYNĪ in Suppl.].

AL-RUHĀ or AL-RUHĀ', the Arabic name of a city which was in early Islamic times in the province of Diyār Muḍar [q.v.] but known in Western sources as EDESSA (Syriac Orhāy, Armenian Urhay). It is now in the province of Diyarbakır in the southeast of modern Turkey and is known as Urfa, a name for the city which is not clearly attested before the coming of the Turks to eastern Anatolia.

1. In pre-Islamic times.

The city is probably an ancient one, though efforts to identify it with the Babylonian Erech/Uruk or with Ur of the Chaldees cannot be taken seriously. Its site, at the junction of ancient highways from Armenia southwards and east-west from the fords across the Euphrates to Mesopotamia and Persia, must have made it strategically valuable when it was founded or re-founded by the Seleucids. Orhāy now received new names, such as "Antioch by the Callirrhoe", i.e. "by the beautiful, flowing [water]", a reference to its famed fish-ponds or to the river of Orhāy, and Edessa, originally the name of the Seleucids' own capital in Macedonia.

The names of the local rulers, called by the Greeks Phylarchs or Toparchs, are known. The early ones were vassals of the Parthians, in whose political and cultural sphere Edessa lay, but in the 2nd century A.D. it came sporadically under Roman rule, with its kings therefore as Roman vassals. These kings seem to have been of Arabic stock, although their regnal names included Iranian as well as Semitic ones. In the early 3rd century they are said to have adopted Christianity, and certainly, by the early 4th century the whole of the city was Christian and famed as the first kingdom officially to adopt Christianity as its state religion, a prominent role being assigned to King Abgar V, who was said to have acknowledged Jesus Christ as the Son of God before His crucifixion.

The monarchy in Edessa had ended ca. 242, affected adversely by the appearance on the scene in the Near East of the aggressive and expansionist Sāsānid Persian empire and the Roman withdrawal from much of the Mesopotamian countryside, although the Romans and the Byzantines retained dominion over the city until the Arab invasions. Edessa now became a major centre for Syriac-language literary activity and for Christian religious life, becoming, like most of Mesopotamia and Syria, Monophysite in theology during the course of the 6th century. When the Arabs appeared, there were in the city a small community of Nestorians, a Melkite hierarchy and community, and the two ethnic elements of Monophysites, the Syrian Jacobites (the majority in Edessa) and the Armenians.

2. The Islamic period up to the Ottomans.

Abū 'Ubayda in 16/637 sent 'Iyād b. Ḡhanm to al-Djazīra. After the Greek governor Joannes Kateas, who had endeavoured to save the region of Osrohoëne by paying tribute, had been dismissed by the emperor Heraclius and the general Ptolemaius put in his place, al-Ruhā' (Edessa) had to surrender in 18/639 like the other towns of Mesopotamia (al-Balāḡhūrī, 172-5; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ii, 414-17; Yākūt, s.v. al-Djazīra; Kh̲wārazmī, ed. Baethgen, *Fragmente syr. u. arab. Historiker*, Leipzig 1884, 16, 110 = *Abh. KM*, viii, no. 3; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, 517, 521). The town now lost its political and very soon also its religious significance and sank to the level of a second-rate provincial town. Its last bishop of note, Jacob of Edessa, spent only four years (684-7) and a later period again of four months in his office (708). The Maronite Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785) wrote a "Chronicle of the World" and translated into Syriac the "two Books of Homer about Ilion".

Al-Ruhā', like al-Raḡḡa, Harrān and Ḳarḳisiya, was usually reckoned to Diyār Muḍar (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, viii, 218; al-Ya'ḳūbī, i, 177; M. Hartmann, *Bohtān*, 88, no. 2 and 3 = *MVAG* [1897], i, 28; Canard, *H'amdānides*, 91-2). In 57/686-7 al-Ruhā', Harrān and Sumaysāt formed the governorship which Ibrāhīm b. al-Aṣṭar granted to Hātim b. al-Nu'mān (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, iv, 218).

The "old church" of the Christians was destroyed by two earthquakes (3 April 679 and 718). In 737 a Greek named Baṣḥīr appeared in Harrān and gave himself out to be "Tiberias the son of Constantine"; he was believed at first, but was later exposed and executed in al-Ruhā' (Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, ed. Bedjan, 119). In 133/750-1 the town was the scene of fighting between Abū Dja'far, afterwards the caliph al-Manṣūr, and the followers of the Umayyads, Ishāk b. Muslim al-ʿUḳaylī and his brother Bakkār, who only gave in after the death of Marwān (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, v, 333-4). But continual revolts broke out again in al-Djazīra (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, v, 370 ff.); in the reign of al-Manṣūr, for example, the governor of al-Ruhā' of the same name, the builder of Hiṣn Manṣūr, was executed in al-Raḡḡa in 141/758-9 (al-Balāḡhūrī, 192). When Hārūn al-Raṣhīd passed through al-Ruhā', an attempt was made to cast suspicion upon the Christians and it was said that the Byzantine emperor used to come to the city every year secretly in order to pray in their churches; but the caliph saw that these were slanders. The Gūmayē (from al-Djūma, the valley of 'Afrīn in Syria), who, with the Telmaḡrāyē and Ruṣāfāyē, were one of the leading families of al-Ruhā', suffered a good deal, however, from his covetousness (Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 130). In 196/812 the Christians were only able to save the unprotected town from being plundered by the rebels Naṣr b. Shabāth [q.v.] and 'Amr by a heavy payment; Abū Shayḡh therefore fortified al-Ruhā' at the ex-

pense of the citizens (Barhebraeus, 136-7). At the beginning of his reign, al-Ma'mūn sent his general Tāhir *Dhu 'l-Yaminayn* [q.v.] to al-Ruhā², where his Persian soldiers were besieged by the two rebels, but offered a successful resistance supported by the inhabitants among whom was Mār Dionysius of Tellmahārē (Barhebraeus, 139). Tāhir, who himself had fled from his mutinous soldiers to Kallinikos, won the rebels over to his side and made 'Abd al-A'lā governor of al-Ruhā²; he oppressed the town very much (*ibid.*, 139-40). Muḥammad b. Tāhir, who governed al-Djazīra in 210/825, persecuted the Christians in al-Ruhā², as did the governors under al-Mu'taṣim and his successors.

In 331/942-3 the Byzantines occupied Diyārbakr, Arzan, Dārā and Rās al-'Ayn, advanced on Naṣībīn and demanded from the people of al-Ruhā² the holy picture on linen of Christ called *μαρδύλιον* (*al-Īkōna al-Mandil*); with the approval of the caliph al-Muttakī, it was handed over in return for the release of 200 Muslim prisoners and the promise to leave the town undisturbed in future (Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṣākī, ed. Kračkovskiy-Vasil'ev, in *Patrol. Orient.*, xviii, 730-2; Thābit b. Sinān, ed. Baethgen, in *op. cit.*, 90, 145). The picture reached Constantinople on 15 August 944, where it was brought with great ceremony into the Church of St. Sophia and the imperial palace (see in addition to Yahyā, *loc. cit.*, al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, ii, 331 = § 753; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 302, and an oration ascribed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus on the εἰκὼν ἀχειροποίητος or *De imagine Edessena*, ed. Migne, *Patrol. Graec.*, cxiii, col. 432, better ed. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, xviii). But by 338/949-50 this treaty was broken by the Ḥamdānīd Sayf al-Dawla, who, together with the inhabitants of al-Ruhā², made a raid on al-Maṣṣīsa (Yahyā, *op. cit.*, 732). Under the Domesticus Leo the Byzantines in 348/959-60 entered Diyār Bakr and advanced on al-Ruhā² (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 393). The emperor Nicephorus Phocas towards the end of 357/967-8 advanced on Diyār Muḍar, Mayyāfārikin and Kafarūthā (Yahyā, 815). According to Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 454, below), al-Ruhā² was burned to the ground in Muḥarram 361/October-November 971 and troops left in al-Djazīra. One should rather read Muḥarram 362/October-November 972 and take the reference to be to the campaign of John Tzimiskēs, unless there is a confusion between Edessa and Emesa (Hims) which was burned in 358/969 (Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 190).

Ibn Hawkal in *ca.* 367/978 refers to over 300 churches in al-Ruhā², and al-Muḥaddasī reckons the cathedral, the ceilings of which were richly decorated with mosaics, among the four wonders of the world.

Down to 416/1025-6, the town belonged to the chief of the Banū Numayr, 'Uṭayr. The latter installed Aḥmad b. Muḥammad as *nā'ib* there, but afterwards had him assassinated. The inhabitants thereupon rebelled and offered the town to Naṣr al-Dawla the Marwānīd of Diyārbakr (Greek Ἀπομερμάνης), who had it occupied by Zangī. After the murder of 'Uṭayr and the death of Zangī (418/1027), Naṣr al-Dawla gave 'Uṭayr's son one tower of al-Ruhā² and another to Shībī's son (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 244). The former (according to others, a Turk Salmān, Σαλαμάνης, appointed governor, who was hard pressed by 'Uṭayr's widow) then sold the fortress for 20,000 darics and four villages to the Byzantine Protospatharius Georgius Maniakes, son of Gudelius, who lived in Samosata; he appeared suddenly one night and occupied three towers. After a vain attempt by the Marwānīd *amir* of Mayyāfārikin to drive him out again, in

which the town, which was still inhabited by many Christians, was sacked and burned (winter of 1030-1), Maniakes again occupied the citadel and the town (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 281 *bis*; Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, iii, 147; Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 214; Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, c. 7, pp. 24-5; Matthew of Edessa, ed. 1898, c. 43, pp. 58-62 = tr. Dulaurier, 46-9; Cedrenus-Seylitzes, ed. Bonn, ii, 500; the accounts of the events preceding the surrender differ very much). Edessa under Maniakes seems to have enjoyed a certain amount of independence from Byzantium, as he sent an annual tribute thither (Cedrenus-Seylitzes, 502).

In Rajab 427/May 1036, the Patricius of Edessa became a prisoner of the Numayrī Ibn Waṭṭhāb and his many allies; the town was plundered but the fortress remained in the hands of the Greek garrison (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 305; Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 217). By the peace of 428/1037 the emperor again received complete possession of Edessa which was refortified (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 313; Barhebraeus, 221).

According to the Armenian sources, Maniakes was followed by Apuk'ap or Ἀβὺν Ἀπενδρηγός, then by the Iberian Βαρασβατζῆ as strategus of Edessa; in 1059 Ἰωάννης ὁ Δουκῆζης was catapanus of the town. In 1065-6 and 1066-7, the Turks under the Khurāsān-Sālār attacked the town and the Saldjūk Alp Arslān besieged it for fifty days in 462/1070; it was defended by Wasil (son of the Bulgar king Alōsian?). After the victory of Malāzgird [q.v.], Edessa was to be handed over to the sultan, but the defeated emperor Romanus Diogenes had no longer any authority over it, and its Catapanus Paulus went to his successor in Constantinople (Scylitzes, ed. Bonn, 702). In 1081-2 Edessa was again besieged by an *amir* named Khusrāw, but in vain. After the death of Wasil, the Armenian Smbat became lord of Edessa and six months later (23 September 1083) Philaretus Brachamius succeeded him. But he lost it in 1086-7 when, in his absence, his deputy was murdered and the town handed over to the Saldjūk sultan Malikshāh. The latter appointed the *amir* Buzān governor of al-Ruhā² and Harrān. When the latter had fallen in 487/1094 fighting against Tutush [q.v.], Tutush's general Alpyārūk occupied the town, but it was not plundered by his army as he was poisoned by a Greek dancing-girl called Galī. Then the Armenian Kuropalates T'oros (Theodorus), son of Het'um, took the citadel. When in 1097-8 Count Baldwin of Bouillon captured Tell Bāshir, T'oros asked him to come to al-Ruhā² to assist him against their joint enemies, and received him with joy, but was shortly afterwards treacherously murdered by him (Matthew of Edessa, ed. 1898, 260-2 = tr. Dulaurier, 218-21; *Anonym. Syriac chronicle of 1203-1204*, in Chabot, *C.-R. Acad. Inscr. Lettr.* [1918], 431 ff.).

From 1098 the Latins ruled for half a century the "County of Edessa" to which also belonged Sumaysāt and Sarūdj (1098 Baldwin of Bouillon) I; 1100 Baldwin of Bourg II; 1119 Joscelin (de Courtenay) I; 1131 the latter's son Joscelin II). The town suffered a great deal under them, and there was some justification for Matthew of Edessa's comment that Baldwin du Bourg "hated Christians more than Turks". Ecclesiastical disputes, for instance, on the vexed question of the date for celebrating Easter, divided the Christians, Latin versus Monophysites. Despite their private jealousies, the Crusaders managed to hold on to the county of Edessa, largely because of the divided counsels of the Muslim *amirs*, but with the rise of the resolute and skilful Atabeg of Mawṣil, 'Imād al-Dīn Zangī—coinciding in 1143 with the deaths of two of

the strongest figures in the Christian camp, the Byzantine emperor John II Comnenus and Fulk, king of Jerusalem—the days of Crusader control over Edessa were numbered.

On 25 Djumādā II 539/23 December 1144, 'Imād al-Dīn Zangī took it (a detailed description of these events in the *Anonymous Syriac chronicle of 1203-1204*, ed. Chabot, in *CSCO*, series iii, vol. xv, 118-26; tr. Chabot, *Une épisode de l'histoire des Croisades*, in *Mélanges Schlumberger*, i, Paris 1924, 171-9). Under Joscelin II and Baldwin of Kaysūm, the Franks again attempted to retake the town in October 1046 and succeeded in entering it by night, but six days later Nūr al-Dīn appeared with 10,000 Turks, and soon occupied and sacked it; the inhabitants were put to death or carried into slavery. Baldwin was killed and Joscelin escaped to Sumaysāt (Barhebraeus, 311-12). The fall of this eastern bulwark of the Crusaders aroused horror everywhere; in Europe it led to the Second Crusade. The Syrian Dionysius bar Šalībī as Diaconus wrote an 'oration' and two poetic *mimrē* about the destruction of the town. Three similar pieces were written by Basilios Abu 'l-Faraǧ b. Šhummānā, the favourite of Zangī; he had also written a history of the town of Orhāy (Baumstark, *Gesch. d. syr. Lit.*, 293, 298).

After the death of Nūr al-Dīn, his nephew Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī took the town in 1174; in 1182 it fell to the Ayyūbid Šalāh al-Dīn, who later handed it over to al-Malik al-Manšūr. When al-Malik al-'Adil died in 1218, his son al-Malik al-Ašraf Šaraf al-Dīn Mūsā became lord of al-Ruhā, Harrān and Khilāt. In June 1234 the town was taken by the army of the Rūm Saldjūkh 'Alā' al-Dīn Kaykubād and its inhabitants deported to Asia Minor (Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-'Adīm, tr. Blochet, in *ROL*, v, 88; Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 468). But it was retaken within four months by al-Malik al-Kāmil. In 1244 the Mongols passed through the district of al-Ruhā and in 1260 the troops of Hülegü. The people of al-Ruhā and Harrān surrendered voluntarily to him, but those of Sarūdī were all put to death (Barhebraeus, *Chron. syr.*, 509; *Chron. arab.*, ed. Beirut, 486).

In the time of Abu 'l-Fidā', al-Ruhā was in ruins. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī in ca. 740/1340 could still see isolated ruins of the main buildings. According to al-Kāḷāshandī, the town had been rebuilt by his time (ca. 1400) and repopulated and was in a prosperous state. In connection with the campaigns of Timūr, who conquered al-Djazīra in 1393, al-Ruhā is repeatedly mentioned in the *Zafar-nāma* of Šaraf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī (written in 828/1425).

Bibliography: For older bibliography, see Honigmann's *Et' art. Orfa*. The information of the geographers is given in Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, 103-4, see also Naval Intelligence Division, Admiralty Handbooks, *Turkey*, London 1942-3, ii, 588-90. On history, see now Canard, *H'amdanides*, 91-2, 747-52; R. Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades*, Paris 1948, i, 382 ff., ii, 53-145, 169-209; S. Runciman, *A history of the Crusades*. ii. *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East 1100-1187*, Cambridge 1952, 107-39, 225-44; M.W. Baldwin (ed.), *A history of the Crusades*. i. *The first hundred years*, Philadelphia 1955; J.B. Segal, *Edessa 'The Blessed City'*, Oxford 1970.

(E. HONIGMANN-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

3. The Ottoman and modern periods.

Al-Ruhā was conquered by sultan Selīm I, probably in 923/1517. The first Ottoman tax register was compiled in 924/1518; the tax-paying population at that time consisted of 782 Muslim families and 75 bachelors, 300 Christian families and 42 bachelors,

amounting to a total of 1,082 families and 117 bachelors, or an estimated population total of slightly over 5,500. This low figure was probably due to the upheavals of the Ottoman-Šafawid War, for only eight years later, in 932/1526, the tax-paying population had increased to 988 Muslim and 334 Christian families, along with 182 Muslim and 89 Christian bachelors. Moreover, 213 Ottoman military men had settled in the town, thus bringing total population to about 8,000 people. A further tax register from the last year of Süleyman the Magnificent (973/1566) records 1,704 Muslim and 866 Christian families, along with 705 Muslim and 221 Christian bachelors; these figures point to a total population of 13,000-14,000 inhabitants. The town consisted of five large *maḥalles* named after the five gates and must have possessed an active textile industry, for the dye houses of al-Ruhā and nearby Harrān produced the impressive revenue of 100,000 *akčē*. A *bedestān* is also on record.

In the 10th/16th century, al-Ruhā formed part of the *beglerbeglik* of Diyārbekir, and was located on the caravan route from Mawšil and Mārdīn to Aleppo. It was therefore visited by several European travellers, among them an anonymous merchant whose travel account was published in 971-2/1564. He mentions the principal features of the town which were to recur in European travel accounts throughout more than two centuries: the strong walls and impressive citadel, the sanctuary of Abraham/Ibrāhīm, venerated by Christians and particularly by Muslims, the fishpond next to the sanctuary, and, at a distance from the town, a well frequented by lepers and other sick people. A few years later, al-Ruhā was visited by the Augsburg physician and botanist Rauwolf (982/1575), who describes the town as handsome and well-built. The town possessed a lively trade in rugs and carpets, which were sometimes sold to Europe, and also served as a point of transit for goods from Damascus, Aleppo and Istanbul, which were sold in Persia and 'Irāk.

The most detailed description of al-Ruhā/Urfa before the 13th/19th century is due to the Ottoman traveller Ewliyā Čelebi, who passed through the town (which he calls Urfa, as do all other visitors of this period) in 1056/1646. His interest in it may have been due to the fact that one of his relatives had served as a *kādī* there. He describes two fortresses, one the citadel on the hill and the other a fortified settlement (*wārūsh*). The citadel he links with King Nimrod, and the two Roman columns standing there Ewliyā interprets as a catapult with which this ruler supposedly had the prophet Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl (Abraham) thrown into the fire. Otherwise, the citadel contained 20 small houses inhabited by the commander (*dizdār*) and his 200 men, in addition to a mosque, an armoury, a barn and a number of cisterns. Ewliyā mentions only three gates, partly with names different from those recorded in the 10th/16th century tax register. He claims to have counted 2,600 houses in the fortified section. If his count was accurate and the area outside the fortifications remained uninhabited, the town must have stagnated since 973/1566. As Ewliyā's figures concerning houses are generally more generous than the household data found in late 10th/16th century tax registers, the upheavals of the Djelālī period, particularly the occupation by the forces of Qarā Yazīdī in 1008/1599-1600, must have taken their toll. Houses were generally built of mud brick, but there were quite a few opulent residences with their own gardens and baths, belonging to pashas and more rarely to *kādīs*.

He also enumerates 22 mosques; the mosque

known as Kızıl Djami⁶ was considered to be of great age and a former monastery, converted into a mosque by Hārūn al-Rashīd. The minaret, undated, often has been regarded as the bell tower of the church which formerly stood on the mosque site, but according to Gabriel, it is an original minaret. Ewliyā has also picked up a legend of Jesus' visit to al-Ruhā and his stay in a local monastery. Ewliyā records three *medreses*; the *medreses* possessed no *wakf* revenues, but the traveller comments on the multitude of Kurdish scholars, both in the *medreses* proper and in the local *dār al-ḥadīth* and *dār al-kurʿā*. There were also three *zāwiyes*. Among the public kitchens, the most notable was the *ʿimāret* of Ibrāhīm, supposedly built by the caliph al-Ma'mūn. Connected with the *ʿimāret* was al-Ruhā/Urfa's major sanctuary, dedicated to Ibrāhīm by Ṣalāh al-Dīn Ayyūbī's nephew al-Malik al-Aṣḥraf (608/1211-12), and visited by pilgrims from all over the Islamic world.

Ewliyā was not much impressed with the shopping streets and markets of al-Ruhā/Urfa; but though the Kūre Çarshisi was not of imposing appearance, quantities of valuable goods were sold there. He records a total of 400 shops and a large number of mills, one of them named for a certain Tayyāroghlu Ahmed Pasha. The town also possessed a tannery; here a superior quality of yellow maroquin leather was manufactured. According to the French merchant Tavernier, al-Ruhā/Urfa, along with Tokāt and Diyārbekir, was the source of the finest maroquin leathers. In addition, the town was noted for its cotton fabrics, and there was also some silk production.

Ewliyā's account is confirmed by the description of Tavernier, who passed through the town in 1054/1644. On his sight-seeing tour, this merchant and traveller saw many houses poorly built or even totally in ruins; there were so many empty lots that Tavernier compared the town to a desert. He also observed rugs and carpets spread out by the side of the fish pond, and commented on the veneration Muslims felt for this site. A church in the midst of a cemetery supposedly had been selected by St. Alexis as a place of retreat; and not far from the town Tavernier was able to see the Armenian church and monastery of St Ephrem in the midst of a Christian necropolis. This monastery was partly located in grottoes cut into the living rock, a feature of the local landscape also noted by Ewliyā and many other travellers; in the early 13th/19th century they were used as habitations.

When Thévenot passed through al-Ruhā/Urfa in 1074/1664, the damages mentioned by Ewliyā and Tavernier were still clearly visible. A valuable record of al-Ruhā/Urfa's otherwise poorly documented 13th/18th century is found in the accounts of revenues and expenditures pertaining to the mosque of Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl and the then newly constructed Ridwāniyye *medrese*. These survive for a few years beginning with 1151/1738-39 (Osmanlı Arşivi, İstanbul, Maliyeden Müdevver 2004). The register contains a listing of the shops, gardens, mills and public baths belonging to these foundations, along with information about tenants and rents. The foundations also received rent from the Aladja Khān, in addition to a mulberry orchard located in front of the *medrese*. These accounts document the existence of a flourishing *çarşı*, with relatively few properties untenanted. Apparently Urfa's recovery was under way by this time. Thévenot also commented on the large number of ruined houses, even though the walls were in good condition and the town populous.

The Danish traveller Niebuhr passed through the town in the spring of 1179-80/1766, and produced a

sketch map of the built-up area, which shows the town as possessing four gates, but there must have been an entrance to the citadel, even though his sketch does not show any. Thus we can understand why most accounts mention only four gates, while the Ottoman tax registers and B. Poujoulat (before 1256/1840) record five. His account mentions twelve minarets, of which the mosque of Khalīl al-Rahmān was the most notable, and also two Christian churches within the walls. The Armenian church was in a largely ruinous condition, but the surviving part richly decorated with Persian rugs; the congregation numbered about 500 families, while the Jacobite church served only about 150 persons. In Niebuhr's time, Turkish was the principal language spoken in al-Ruhā/Urfa, but merchants and mule drivers usually knew Arabic and Kurdish as well.

However, in socio-economic terms, the richest travel account between Ewliyā's time and the republican period is due to Buckingham. He visited the town in 1234/1816, and as Ottoman-Wahhābī warfare closed the roads, spent considerable time there. By his time, the name al-Ruhā had been almost completely supplanted by Urfa, the only people who still called the town by its old name being Christian Arabs. He estimated the town's population as 50,000 persons; 47,500 were Muslims, 2,000 Christians and 500 were Jews. However, Poujoulat, who was in Urfa before 1256/1840, claims that the population consisted of only about 15,000 (14,000 Muslims, 1,000 Armenians, 100 Jacobites). As in Aleppo, the town consisted of two factions, namely the Janissaries and the *sherifs*, and Buckingham complained of the former's lack of discipline. Buckingham describes the houses as consisting of good masonry, and resembling those of Aleppo; many of the townsmen obviously lived more comfortably than their forefathers, who had made do with the mud brick seen by Ewliyā and his contemporaries. *Harem* and *selāmlık* were separated by a courtyard; the upper floors of the *selāmlıks* generally contained opulently furnished reception rooms. Because of the insecurity due to warfare, many of the bazaars were closed; but in more peaceful times, the townsmen were still known for their lively cotton trade. Buckingham was even able to observe cotton printers at work. In addition, rough woollen cloth and rugs, the latter of good quality, were manufactured in Urfa. Goods from India, Persia and Anatolia were ordinarily available. The traveller mentions mohair fabrics from Ankara, which he calls shalloons, and some cashmere shawls.

A slightly later description of Urfa is due to the Prussian officer von Moltke, who visited it in 1254/1838. He mentions a mosque which he does not name, and which must have been the Kızıl Djami⁶, for the structure is described as a solidly-built tower of great antiquity. The author also visited a large foundation adjacent to the two fishponds, which he describes as a *medrese* and which must have been the foundation which Ṣalāh al-Dīn had added to the mosque of Ibrāhīm (587/1191). He also made a map of the town and recorded the presence of numerous orchards.

From 1307-8/1890 or slightly earlier dates the description by Cuinet. According to him, the town possessed a population of 55,000, of whom 40,835 were Muslims; about 1297/1880, Sachau had estimated the number of Urfa's inhabitants at minimally 50,000. However, these optimistic evaluations were contradicted by Djewdet Pasha's claim (1298/1881) that Urfa *kaḍā* consisted of only 2,380 households or families (1,337 Muslims, 1,003 Christians, 29 Jews).

If we compare the estimates by Buckingham and Sachau-Cuinet, it would seem that population growth in the 13th/19th century was just able to compensate for wartime population losses, and Urfa's population must have been at a low ebb for several decades in the mid-century. Private houses in Cuinet's time were generally built in rough or even regularly hewn stone. The streets possessed wide pavements, while a channel in the centre served for the evacuation of water and household waste. The city walls had deteriorated, but the citadel apparently was in better condition. The town now possessed 18 *medreses* with 500 students, in addition to a *rüşdiyye*. There were also primary schools for the children of the various Christian churches, so that a total of 2,464 students were receiving a formal education.

At this time, Urfa was a flourishing centre of textile manufacture. The cotton industry survived the competition by factory-woven textiles, partly because manufacturers switched to imported thread which was woven locally. However, to remain competitive, weavers were forced to accept very low wages. By the early 20th century the ancient trade route linking northern Mesopotamia with Aleppo had revived, and Urfa's new prosperity permitted the construction of a town quarter *extra muros*. This development was, however, cut short when, after the fall of the Ottoman Empire Syria became a French and 'Irāka British mandate. British and later French troops occupied Urfa in 1919-20. After severe fighting, which included a local uprising, the Treaty of Lausanne determined the inclusion of Urfa into the newly-founded Republic of Turkey (1923).

Throughout the Republican period, it has not been possible to re-establish Urfa's former trade links. This situation has emphasised the agricultural character of the *vilayet*. Grain is the main crop; apart from wheat, barley and beans are also significant. Productivity is often low, as much of the land is subject to erosion. A significant share of the grain grown is not intended for the market. Irrigation is a precondition for increasing productivity, and the regulation of the Fırat (Euphrates), the region's only important body of water, is expected to expand the area amenable to irrigation.

Limited opportunities in agriculture and the progress of mechanisation have diminished employment here, so that there has been considerable migration of labour to e.g. Adana, Gaziantep and Diyarbakir in search of work; female labour finds work cotton-picking in the Çukurova. Low incomes have likewise limited the progress of education, and literacy rates are lower than the national average. Since 1980-2, however, Urfa has been the site of a college of Dicle University at Diyarbakir, and the foundation of a local university is envisaged by the town's citizens.

Bibliography: G.B. Ramusio (ed.), *Secondo volume delle Navigazioni et viaggi...* Venice 1564, 78; J.Ch. Tayfel, *Il viaggio del molto illustre signor Giovanni Christofoaro Taijfel*, Vienna 1598; J. Gassot, *Lettre écrite d'Alep en Surie...* Bourges 1674, 1684; R. Fitch, *Aanmerklyke Reys na Ormus, Goa, Cambaya...* 1583-91, Leiden 1706; M. Pouillet, *Nouvelles relations du Levant*, Paris 1668, ii, 441-3; J. Thévenot, *Suite du voyage de M^r de Thévenot au Levant...* 2nd part, Paris 1689, 119 ff.; R. Pococke, *A Description of the East and some other Countries*, London 1745, ii/1, 159-61; M. Otter, *Voyages en Turquie et en Perse*, Paris 1748, i, 112-13; C. Niebuhr, *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und umliegenden Ländern*, Copenhagen 1778, ii, 406-10; J.S. Buckingham, *Travels to Mesopotamia, including a journey to Aleppo*, London 1827, 51-129;

W. Ainsworth, *Researches in Assyria, Babylonia and Chaldea...* London 1838, 261-3 (geology of Urfa's site); B. Poujoulat, *Voyage dans l'Asie Mineure...*, Paris 1840, i, 407-19; Ainsworth, *Travels and researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea and Armenia*, London 1842, ii, 103; C. Ritter, *Die Erdkunde*, vii, *West-Asien*, Berlin 1844, 315-56; F. Chesney, *The expedition for the survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris*, London 1850, i, 114, Pl. VII; Ch. Texier, *La ville et les monuments d'Edesse*, in *Revue américaine et orientale*, i (1859), 326-54; H. Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, Leipzig 1861, ii, 351-6; E. Sachau, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, Leipzig 1883, 190-210; V. Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, Paris 1891, ii, 249-63; H. von Moltke, *Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei aus den Jahren 1835 bis 1839*, 5th ed., Berlin 1891, 229-30; Ewliya Çelebi, *Seyāhat-nāme*, iii, Istanbul 1314/1896-7, 148-60; S. Guyer, *Reisen in Mesopotamien*, in *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen* (1916), 172-4; A. Baião (ed.), *Itinerarios da India a Portugal por terra*, Coimbra 1923, 62, 240; A. Gabriel, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, Paris 1940, i, 277-86, 354 ff.; M. Akdağ, *Celâli isyanları (1550-1603)*, Ankara 1963, 190-201; N. Göyünc, *XVI-yüzyılda Mardin sancağı*, Istanbul 1969, 34-5, 41-2, 66, 90, 134; L. Rauwolf, *Aigentliche Beschreibung der Raiss inn die Morgenlaender*, introd. D. Henze, Graz 1971, 258-62; *Urfa il yulığı*, Ankara 1973; Göyünc, *XVI Yüzyılda güney-doğu Anadolu'nun ekonomik durumu: Kanunî Süleyman ve II. Selim devirleri*, in *Türkiye iktisat tarihi semineri*, ed. O. Okyar and Ü. Nalbantoğlu, Ankara 1975, 71-98; M. Köhbach, *Urfa und seine Legendentradition bei Ewliya Çelebi*, in *Der Islam*, lviii (1980), 293-300; J.B. Tavernier, *Les six voyages de Turquie et de Perse*, notes by S. Yérasimos, Paris 1981, i, 244-6; Cevdet Paşa, *Tezâkir*, ed. Cavit Baysun, Ankara 1986, ii, 224, 235; İ. Şahin, *Ewliya Çelebi'nin Urfa hakkında verdiği bilgilerin arşiv belgeleri ışığında değerlendirilmesi*, in *Türklik Araştırmaları dergisi*, iv (1989), 293-8; B. Masters, *The origins of western economic dominance in the Middle East*, New York 1988, 207; S. Yérasimos, *Les voyageurs dans l'Empire ottoman (XIV^e-XVI^e siècles)*, Ankara 1991, 156, 208, 271, 360, 394; *Yurt Ansiklopedisi, Türkiye, II Il, Dünyü, Bugünü, Yarını*, Istanbul 1982-4, art. *Urfa* (authors' names not given); *İA*, art. *Urfa* (Ottoman period by Göyünc; extensive bibl.) (SURAIYA FAROQHI)

RŪHĀNIYYA (A.), a term derived from the adjective *rūhāni* according to a well-known mode for the formation of abstract nouns and generally translated by "spirituality" in modern dictionaries. In the ancient texts, however, its usual meaning is rather that of "spiritual being", except in cases where it refers to the *ḡinns* and the *shayātīn* which, like the *malā'ika*, evade the sensible perception of the majority of men, but are not of a "spiritual" nature. It is in fact in the vocabulary of angelology that it is most often encountered. Among the *falāsifa* and the *Şūfis*, it denotes more specifically the *spiritus rector*, the angel who rules (*mudabbir*) each of the celestial spheres. It is in this sense that the *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā'* (*Rasā'il*, Beirut 1957, xi, 215) speak of "angels which the *ḥukamā'* called *rūhāniyyāt*". Similarly, 'Abd al-Karīm al-Djīlī, in ch. lxiii of his *K. al-Insān al-kāmil*, explains that each of the seven heavens is governed by an angel created *min rūhāniyyati kawkab tilka 'l-samā'*. Among the *Ishrākiyyūn* or Illuminationists, and in particular in the work of al-Suhrawardī, *rūhāniyya* is also used to denote the "angel of the species", the *rabb al-naw'* (see H. Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, Paris 1971, index s.v.).

This word appears frequently in literature relating